

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant cancels claims 1-7 and 15 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant further amends claims 8 and 9 to further clarify the invention and claims 10 and 11 to cure a minor informality.

#### **I. Preliminary Matters**

As preliminary matters, Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim to foreign priority and for indicating receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for returning the initialed form PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on June 23, 2004, November 22, 2006, and February 26, 2007.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate acceptance of the drawing figures filed on June 23, 2004.

Applicant makes minor amendments to the specification. No new matter is being added.

#### **II. Summary of the Office Action**

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 2, 9, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

#### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw these grounds of rejection at least in view of the self-explanatory claim amendments being made herein.

IV. Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 9, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,480,295 to Taoda (hereinafter “Taoda”). Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taoda, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,051 to Moro et al. (hereinafter “Moro”) and claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taoda, in view Moro, in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,034,961 to Moriura et al. (hereinafter “Moriura”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Claims 1-7 and 15 have been cancelled, rendering the rejections with respect to these claims moot.

Of the remaining rejected claims, only claim 8 and 9 are independent. Independent claims 8 and 9 *inter alia* and in some variation recite: performing an area determination for determining which area, in the original, is an area in which a print image exists based on the image data that has been generated by reading the image in the original.

In an exemplary embodiment, an area determination refers to determining which area, in the original, is an area in which a print image exists. The area of the image that is necessary for copy-printing is determined based on the image data obtained according to the original-reading operation for copy-printing the first sheet. Then, for the next copy-printing process, image data only for the area in which the print image actually exists is stored in the interlace buffer based on the area determination (*e.g.*, Figs. 15 and 16 and pages 42-49 of the specification). It will be appreciated that the foregoing remarks relate to the invention in a general sense, the remarks are not necessarily limitative of any claims and are intended only to help the Examiner better understand the distinguishing aspects of the claims mentioned above.

Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest at least these unique features of claims 8 and 9. The Examiner alleges that Taoda discloses the above-noted unique features of claims 8 and 9. That is, the Examiner has mistakenly alleged that the meaning of “area determination” is a determination of whether or not there is any area left in the HDD (memory) as set forth in Taoda (*see* pages 3 and 7 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner’s position is inaccurate.

Taoda discloses that at first, code data of the document 5 is transferred to the LAN I/F 107 of the printer controller 10 through the LAN 2 from the PC 3, and the LAN I/F 107 stores the received code data of the document 5 into a work area of the memory 102. Next, the CPU 101 interprets the code data on the memory 102 and recognizes that two sets each consisting of a document of four pages are to be printed. Then, the CPU 101 goes into rendering processing of code data (steps S101 to S102). In Taoda, at the same time when the print processing is carried out, the CPU 101 checks whether or not a storage area (or empty area) for data exists in the HDD 105. If there is a storage area, image data of the first page of the document 5 is read out from the memory 102 and is transferred to the CODEC 106. Thereafter, compressed data is stored into the memory 102. In this time, the data capacity of the compressed data is confirmed. If there is an empty capacity equivalent to the compressed data, the compressed data of the first page is stored into the HDD 105 (steps S105 to S106) (Fig. 9; col. 6, line 66 to col. 8, line 46).

Taoda, however, discloses checking if there is any area left in the memory and fails to disclose or suggest an area determination process in which it is determined which area, in the original, is an area in which a print image exists. Moro and Moriura fail to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Taoda. For at least these exemplary reasons, claims 8 and 9 are

patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 10-14 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nataliya Dvorson/  
Nataliya Dvorson  
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 5, 2008